

\$~39

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 6154/2018 & C.M. Nos.23813-14/2018  
ANJALI HEALTH EDUCATION & CHARITABLE TRUST

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Dev P.Bhardwaj with Ms.Aruna  
Bhardwaj and Mr.Kanishk Arora, Advs.

versus

ALL INDIA COUNCIL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Anil Soni, S.C. with Mr.Abhinav  
Tyagi, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI**

**ORDER**

%

**30.05.2018**

Vide the present petition, the petitioner, has impugned the order dated 30.04.2018, whereby the petitioner's request for opening of new Pharmacy Institute, has been rejected by the respondent.

Mr.Dev P.Bhardwaj, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the said rejection is mainly premised on the ground that the land on which the petitioner build a new institute was not registered in its name, on the date when it application was considered.

Mr.Bhardwaj further submits that the respondents while rejecting the petitioner's case have overlooked the fact that even though the State of Tripura had already approved the allotment of land in the petitioner favour, the said allotment could not be done only because of invocation of the Model Code of Conduct in the State of Tripura w.e.f. 18.01.2018. He submits that, in view of the fact that the land measuring 5 acres now already stands allotted to the petitioner on 19.05.2018, the respondents ought to reconsider the

petitioner's case as otherwise grave prejudice would be caused to the petitioner, who has taken on lease the requisite structure on the adjacent land itself.

At this stage, Mr. Anil Soni, learned counsel, who appears on advance notice for the respondent, submits that in view of the changed circumstances, the respondent are willing to provide another hearing to the petitioner before the Standing Appellate Committee (SAC) within a period of one week from today. He states that the date, time and place of the said meeting of the hearing, would be communicated not only to the petitioner but would also be communicated to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

He further submits that the respondent would have no objection if the petitioner wishes to furnish any further documents to the SAC, at the time of hearing.

In view of the fair stand taken by learned counsel for the respondent, nothing further survives for adjudication.

Needless to say, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision taken by the respondent, it will be open for the petitioner to take legal recourse as permissible under law.

The present petition alongwith pending applications is disposed of in the above terms.

**REKHA PALLI, J**

**MAY 30, 2018**

sr